UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/648,173	08/25/2000	Rajeev Jayavant	P04211	6232

7590   08/22/2003

Docket Clerk
P O Drawer 800889
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
SINGH, DALIP K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2676	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks

1.   This Office Action is in response to applicant's remarks for reconsideration dated June 16, 2003 in response to PTO Office Action dated February 10, 2003. The applicant's remarks have been carefully considered resulting in the action as set forth herein below.

2.   Applicant's arguments filed June 16, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3.   Regarding applicant's argument that "DiNicola-Herrera combination fails to suggests "dual mode sub-processing circuitry" to perform "motion compenstion operations" associated with 2D image pipeline in one mode and to perform "rasterization operations" associated with a 3D image pipeline in another mode," Examiner submits that such suggestions are indeed found in the above combination. In particular, DiNicola **suggests** dual-mode sub-processing (...an attribute processor (AP) 306 performs preprocessing...incoming 2D and 3D streams...and dispatches work to 3D processing nodes 305 or to the 2D subsystem as appropriate... col. 5, lines 55-61). Regarding applicant's argument that "DiNicola contains no mention that the raster subsystem performs the raster operations while in one of multiple "modes"," DiNicola indeed **suggests** such operations (...2D subsystem, with a direct...path into the raster subsystem...processing for a 2D...data stream in conjunction with a 3D subsystem...col. 3, lines 37-42). DiNicola being deficient in performing "motion compensation operations" is modified by Herrera whereby it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device "two-dimensional image processing" as taught by DiNicola et al. with the feature "motion compensation operations" as taught by Herrera because there are similarities between the process of motion compensation and texture mapping, which is a part of three-dimension graphics data processing, thus providing a cost-effective solution for doing both in one system (col. 13, lines 66-67; col. 14, lines 1-6). Regarding Office action relying

on the graphics engine and the command signal of Herrera as providing the dual modes,

Examiner submits that DiNicola **suggests** the dual mode with Herrera providing the "motion

compensation" teaching. The graphics engine and the command signal of Herrera **suggest** dual

mode operation as well (...the method includes using a graphics engine...the method further

includes using the same graphics engine to generate motion compensated digital image

data...col. 5, lines 67; col. 6, lines 1-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

No. 5,394,524 to DiNicola et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,350 B1 to Herrera.

      a.   Regarding claims 1 and 7, DiNicola et al. **discloses** an image processing circuitry

(graphics subsystem 300, control processing unit 328, RAM 330, Raster subsystem 326),

comprising: a two-dimensional image pipeline (2D subsystem 301) that is operable to

process two dimensional image data (incoming 2D data stream) to generate successive

two dimensional image frames for display in a two-dimensional image space; a

three-dimensional image pipeline (3D processing node 305) that is operable to process

three-dimensional image data to render successive three dimensional image frames for

display in a two-dimensional image space; and dual mode sub-processing circuitry

(attribute processor (AP) 306), associated with each of said two-dimensional image

pipeline (2D subsystem 301) and said three-dimensional image pipeline (3D processing

node 305), to perform rasterization operations (...reordering device 322 combines the

processed 3D data from the processing nodes 305 into a single 3D data stream for

transmission to the raster subsystem 326...col. 7, lines 27-29) associated said

three-dimensional image pipeline in another mode. DiNicola et al. **suggests** a graphics

subsystem comprising a two-dimensional image pipeline that is operable to perform

processing the two dimensional image data (...the ...2D subsystem...provides

...processing for a 2D...data stream...col. 3, lines 37-40) in one mode. However, DiNicola

et al. **does not suggest** motion compensation operations associated with said two-

dimensional image pipeline (2D subsystem 301) in one mode. Herrera **discloses** a

method for generating graphics and processing digital video signals in a computer

system using a graphics engine to generate digital image data based on at least one

command signal similar to "one mode or another" as per the instant claim and the same

graphics engine generating motion compensated digital image data based on at least one

digital image map and at least one motion vector (col. 5, lines 5-67; col. 6, lines 1-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

invention was made to modify the device "two-dimensional image processing" as taught

by DiNicola et al. with the feature "motion compenstion operations" as taught by Herrera

because there are similarities between the process of motion compensation and texture

mapping, which is a part of three-dimension graphics data processing, thus providing a

cost-effective solution for doing both in one system (col. 13, lines 66-67; col. 14, lines 1-

6).

b.   Regarding claims 2 and 8, DiNicola et al. **implicitly discloses** a portion of dual

mode sub-processing circuitry (attribute processor (AP) 306) to perform texture

mapping in said another mode. However, DiNicola et al. **does not suggest explicitly**

to perform texture mapping in said another mode and to sample reference frames in said

one mode.   Herrera **discloses** both the texture mapping and the sampling of reference

frames based on mode of operation (...based on at least one command signal...col. 6, lines 2-3)(...the apparatus includes a setup-engine...a texture mapping engine...bilinear interpolator...determines interpolated digital pixel data based on a first and a second digital pixel data...and averages the results of the first...filtering...to generate...predicted macroblock...col. 5, lines 5-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device "two-dimensional image processing" as taught by DiNicola et al. with the feature "sampling reference frames and texture mapping" as taught by Herrera because there are similarities between the process of motion compensation, which includes sampling reference frames and texture mapping, which is a part of three-dimension graphics data processing, thus providing a cost-effective solution for doing both in one system (col. 13, lines 66-67; col. 14, lines 1-6).

c.   Regarding claims 3 and 9, DiNicola et al. **is silent about** blending samples from a plurality of reference frames in said one mode and to blend samples from a plurality of texture maps in said another mode. Herrera **discloses** blending samples from a plurality of reference frames in said one mode and to blend samples from a plurality of texture maps in said another mode (...the...alpha blending process is provided by making a...change...to the...3D graphics engine 92...then performs the blend...col. 14, lines 7-60; col. 16, lines 66-67; col. 17, lines 1-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by DiNicola et al. with the feature "blending samples from a plurality of reference frames and from a plurality of texture maps" as taught by Herrera because of the similarities between the process of motion compensation, which includes sampling reference frames, and texture mapping, which is a part of three-dimension graphics data processing, and only a slight modification yields a cost-effective solution for blending samples both from

a plurality of reference frames and a plurality of texture maps in both modes in one

system (col. 13, lines 66-67; col. 14, lines 1-6; col. 17, lines 1-38).

d.   Regarding claims 4 and 10, DiNicola et al. **is silent about** processing said

plurality of reference frames using error term in said one mode and to perform alpha

blending in said another mode. Herrera **discloses** processing said plurality of reference

frames using error term in said one mode (...a typical 3D graphics engine 92 is not

configured ...to add a macroblock coefficient...thus in accordance... "8-bit signed

addition ROP" is provided ...to handle the signed addition...col. 14, lines 66-67; col. 15,

lines 1-19) and to perform alpha blending in said another mode (...frame buffer 56 is

depicted as being subdivided into ..."on screen"..."off screen".... contains intermediate

data, such as various texture maps 124a-n...to create/modify the current image...col. 12,

lines 60-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by DiNicola et al. with the

feature "to process plurality of reference frames using error terms and to perform alpha

blending in said another mode" as taught by Herrera because it provides for a cost

effective implementation of processing of reference frames using error terms and alpha

blending in one system (col. 15, lines 1-32).

e.   Regarding claims 5-6, 11-12, Herrera **teaches** a system able to support at least

one MPEG standard (col. 5, lines 24-44) and an alpha blend sub-circuitry that is able to

process at least 8- and 9-bit signed values (col. 13, lines 24-67; col. 14, lines 1-67; col. 15,

lines 1-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time invention was made to modify the device as taught by DiNicola et al. with the

feature "to process MPEG data and alpha blend sub-circuitry able to process 8- and 9-bit

signed values" as taught by Herrera because it provides for a cost effective

implementation of processing of reference frames using error terms and alpha blending in one system (col. 15, lines 1-32).

f.   Regarding claim 13, DiNicole et al. **teaches** the method of operating said dual mode sub-processing circuitry (attribute processor (AP) 306) comprising the step of controlling said dual mode sub-processing circuitry (attribute processor (AP) 306) (...an attribute processor (AP) 306 performs preprocessing...and dispatches work to the 3D.. nodes or to the 2D subsystem...as appropriate...col. 5, lines 55-61).

g.   Regarding claim 14, it is similar in scope to claim 13 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

h.   Regarding claim 15, it is similar in scope to claim 13 and 8 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

i.   Regarding claim 16, it is similar in scope to claim 13 and 9 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

j.   Regarding claim 17, it is similar in scope to claim 13 and 10 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

k.   Regarding claim 18, it is similar in scope to claim 13 and 11 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

l.   Regarding claim 19, it is similar in scope to claim 13 and 12 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

m.   Regarding claim 20, it is similar in scope to claim 13 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

n.   Regarding claim 21, it is similar in scope to claim 15 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

o.   Regarding claim 22, it is similar in scope to claim 16 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

p.   Regarding claim 23, it is similar in scope to claim 17 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

q.   Regarding claim 24, it is similar in scope to claim 18 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

r.   Regarding claim 25, it is similar in scope to claim 19 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

s.   Regarding claim 26, it is similar in scope to claim 1 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Dalip K. Singh** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3895**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu (8:00AM-6: 30PM) Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Matthew Bella**, can be reached at **(703) 308-6829**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the

status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600

Customer Service Office at telephone number :(703)-306-0377.

dks

August 18, 2003

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600